DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 308 598 EA 021 096

AUTHOR Beare, Hedley
TITLE From "Educational Administration" to "Efficient Management": The New Metaphor in Australian Education.
PUB DATE Mar 89
NOTE 34p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association (San Francisco, CA, March 27-31, 1989).
PUB TYPE Speeches/Conference Papers (150) -- Reports - Research/Technical (143)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Educational Administration; *Educational Change; Elementary Secondary Education; Foreign Countries; Government School Relationship; *Instructional Leadership; Politics of Education; *Public Schools; School Based Management
IDENTIFIERS *Australia; *New Zealand

ABSTRACT

This paper examines the status of educational administration (the way the public school systems are configured and managed) in Australia and New Zealand. To indicate the extent and nature of the administrative changes taking place in Australian education, three cameos are considered: New South Wales, Victoria, and the Commonwealth. The three case histories give an impression of constant upheaval, of rapid successions and political maneuvers and of policy turbulence. Illustrated is the kind of atmosphere within which public schools have operated during the decade of the 1980's. Eleven common features and trends are identified. (82 references) (SI)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED308598

From "Educational Administration" to "Efficient Management": The New Metaphor in Australian Education

Hedley Beare
Professor of Education
University of Melbourne

A paper prepared in conjunction with the 1989 Annual Conference of the American Educational Research Association held in San Francisco, March 26-31, 1989, and presented in a symposium on Wednesday March 29 on the topic "New Counter Pressures in Educational Governance: an International Cross-Sectoral Perspective".

[I am indebted to Rosemary Edwards, Leon Guss and William Callander for the assistance they have given in researching the materials for this paper]

EA021096

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

X This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Hedley Beare

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

From "Educational Administration" to "Efficient Management": The New Metaphor in Australian Education

Hedley Beare
Professor of Education
University of Melbourne

A paper prepared in conjunction with the 1989 Annual Conference of the American Educational Research Association held in San Francisco, March 26-31, 1989, and presented in a symposium on Wednesday March 29 on the topic "New Counter Pressures in Educational Governance: an International Cross-Sectoral Perspective".

[I am indebted to Rosemary Edwards, Leon Guss and William Callander for the assistance they have given in researching the materials for this paper]

I
Changes to administrative structures, 1988-89

As the 1989 school year began, reconstruction was afoot in every public school system in Australia and New Zealand. Throughout the whole decade of the 1980s, all Australian schools (government, non-government and Catholic) and all education systems (especially the public ones) have been subjected to almost continuous restructuring of one kind or another. In this paper we concentrate on educational administration, on the way public school systems are configured and managed. To indicate the extent and nature of the administrative changes taking place in Australian education, consider these three cameos.

New South Wales:

The largest school system in the country, the New South Wales (NSW) state system, was undergoing two major reviews as 1989 began. Both of them will have widespread ramifications and taken together they could lead to a substantial rebuilding of the system. While restructuring was widespread elsewhere in the nation during the decade, NSW appeared to maintain its stability, but the system experienced a number of shocks in1988.

Mr Robert Winder, the NSW Director-General of Education and one of Australia's eminent educators, retired at the beginning of1988. Signalling that it saw the need for change, the Labor government appointed as his replacement an educator from outside both the system and the State. Dr Gregor Ramsey, a former South Australian, had been until his new appointment a full-time Commissioner of the federal body coordinating and funding tertiary education across the country. Ramsey was seen as a Labor appointee.

In the State election held early in 1988, the long established Labor government was unseated and replaced by a conservative coalition headed by Nick Griener, a Harvard Business School graduate committed to economic rationalism and a hard-line approach to government budgetting. Following the swearing in of the new Minister of Education (Dr Terry Metherell), the new Director-General was dis-appointed; he had been in the post for about six weeks. Dr Ramsey returned to Canberra to take over the Chairmanship of the Higher Education Council, which itself had been newly created by the national Minister for Education (Mr John Dawkins).

The chief education executive post was then filled by Dr Fenton Sharpe who, as Deputy Director-General, had been the heir apparent from within the system. But he was appointed for a one-year term only. The policy initiatives which the new Minister put in train included the effective dismantling of the NSW Education Commission, of some staffing structures and of working conditions agreements which the teachers union had negotiated over the years. The Minister also proposed
a return to traditional academic standards - "the three r's" - with the introduction of more selective schools, changes to the HSC curriculum so that maths and science were compulsory, and the down-grading of non-academic subjects.... (He) said 2500 teacher jobs would go, and he tried to increase classroom hours for teachers.

His actions caused public opposition from parents, teachers, and students (McAsey, 1989: 11).

The government then set up its two inquiries, one, aimed at improving
the efficiency of the administration of the school system and headed by one of the country's most respected business consultants (Dr Brian Scott), was due to report to the government in April. The second, a much wider- ranging select committee headed by a former national Minister of Education (Sir John Carrick), was asked to report later in 1989.

As the 1989 school year began, then, a question mark hung over the administration of the NSW school system and the uncertainty will not be removed until the Scott Report is to hand. Scott is likely to recommend substantial alteration to the system's administrative structure and the Liberal/National government seems certain to accept what he recommends. Among the casualties could be the office of Director-General of Education itself, and the fairly centralist approaches which have characterized NSW education.

Victoria:
Victoria has been in the forefront of the reconstruction movement for the past ten years. In January of 1988, a new structure (it could be regarded as either the third or the fourth since 1980) came into operation, requiring the drafting of some three thousand people out of their previous positions into new ones. It was an awesome and complex manoeuvre.

It followed the abolition of the Victorian Education Department and its replacement with a single Ministry of Education. The office of Director-General of Education had been dispensed with, and a Chief

Executive was named to head the Ministry. But there was a strange sequel to the supposed streamlining of the portfolio. A Cabinet re-shuffle led to the appointment of two Ministers to the super-Ministry!

At the October 1988 State election, the senior of the two Ministers (Mr Ian Cathie) retired from Parliament. The Labor Party was re-elected to office, and in the subsequent reallocation of portfolios, Ms Joan Kirner became the new Minister for Education. Mrs Kirner had been a foundation member of the Australian Schools Commission during the 1970s, she had earned a national reputation for her involvement with the parents-in-schools movement, and she had played a formative role in the party's Education Policy Committee. There could be few politicians with better preparation for or knowledge about the Education portfolio. The previous incumbent Minister (Ms Caroline Hogg) became the second Minister for the portfolio, with responsibility for post-school education.

But more was to follow. Early in 1989, the Deputy Premier Mr Robert Fordham (himself a former Education Minister) was forced to resign from the front bench because of allegations of mismanagement in the Victorian Economic Development Commission for which he was the responsible Minister. Ms Kirner was then elected Deputy Premier, a position she held concurrently with the Education portfolio; Ms Hogg was assigned to the Health portfolio, and Evan Walker had the subsidiary Education portfolio (responsibility for post-school education) added to his Cabinet brief.

The administrative changes which accompanied these ministerial moves were also significant. Mr Kevin Collins had been acting as Chief Executive of the Ministry while the substantive appointee, Dr Graham Allen, was on extended sick leave. On the day Dr Allen returned to his office, Ms Kirner advised him that he should retire. Mr Collins reverted to his substantive post of Chief General Manager, Schools Division - in effect, the position which had replaced that of Director-General of Education, the professional head of the public school system. Dr Allen's position was then filled by the transfer of Ms Anne Morrow from the Premier's Department to head the Education portfolio. Although she is a former teacher, the Chief Executive position appeared to have gone to a public service insider and not to a person publicly visible as an educator. The move therefore semaphored the message from government that tight budgetary and administrative control was a priority for education.

Then in a series of fairly deft moves, Minister Kirner had the Schools Division granted the powers of a statutory authority, thereby restoring some autonomy to the huge division which was running the public schools. She remodelled the Ministry by combining two Divisions with portfolio-wide responsibilities and by changing the branches within the Schools Division. They were significant reconstructions, but they were called "fine-tuning", a re-structuring that was not to be labelled as such. The Minister's view, soundly based, was that constant restructuring over a decade had destabilized the schools, lowered teacher morale, and weakened public confidence in education.

Finally, Collins, who had occupied several of the most senior postings over the decade and who had helped to maintain some stability during all of the restructures, announced his retirement. The new Minister therefore inherited a situation in which she could have a substantial voice in naming Collins' successor.

The Commonwealth:

The Commonwealth Education portfolio has been through a profound change since the 1987 federal election. Even though the Labor Government was returned to office, the new Minister (John Dawkins), who had been associated with the finance and trade portfolios, brought a market economy mentality to Education. The Department was reconstituted as a "super-Ministry" of Employment, Education and Training; the order of the terms in the title was interesting, but the combination also foreshadowed the new environment into which education was being placed. The Schools Commission and the Tertiary Education Commission, both innovations of the Labor Party during the 1970s, were abolished, and established in their place was a National Board for Employment, Education and Training (NBEET), which had as its subsidiaries a Schools Council, a Higher Education Council, a Training Council and a Research Council. The new Board institutionalized direct political influence and control in place of "buffer committees", the rationale behind such bodies as the UK's University Grants Committee.

Several experienced educators left the new federal Department, now headed by an economist with an industrial training orientation.

Higher education was the first area to experience policy upheavals, precipitated by the Dawkins Green Paper and White Paper. There followed proposals to amalgamate universities and colleges of advanced education, the creation of a "unified national system" of higher education, a research funding agenda more geared to national priorities, and an industrial agreement which, in exchange

for a second tier wage rise of four per cent, required that academic staff submit to a system of performance appraisal and review.

In 1988, the national Minister issued a discussion paper entitled Strengthening Australia's Schools (May 1988) which signalled that federal interest was now being turned to primary and secondary education, areas which the federal constitution had left as residual powers of the States. In a statement issued in June, he asked for *greater commonality in curriculum framework and assessment, better public accountability, improved teacher quality, improved approaches to increase school retention rates and more productive and effective use of resources (Media Release, 23 June 1988, Darwin)*

The Australian Education Council (AEC)- the council of Ministers of Education from around Australia - had moved into the vacuum left by the demise of the Schools Commission, in effect, an overtly political body assuming the position occupied formerly by a buffer commission. In particular, the AEC during 1988 and 1989 considered whether a "national curriculum" should be devised for all Australian schools, issuing early in 1989 a set of documents entitled Mapping the Australian Curriculum.

These three recent case histories give an impression of constant upheaval, of rapid successions and political manoevres, of policy turbulence. They illustrate the kind of atmosphere within which public schools have operated during the decade of the 1980s.

II
The pattern emerges: New South Wales, South Australia, and the Commonwealth

Upheaval is almost endemic to school systems these days, and it is occurring in other countries as much as it is in Australian States and Territories. The changes in New Zealand in the wake of the Picot Report, or those effected by the Thatcher government in Great Britain, or the spate of reports on education in the United States during the 1980s, or the reconstruction proposed for Japan in the reports of the National Commission for Educational Reform between 1984 and 1987 illustrate the point.

Reforms of this magnitude and across a whole nation do begin to show common features, even though within any State or system there is a tendency to be so obsessed by what is happening locally

that a clear national perspective or even a knowledge about the changes in other places cannot be taken for granted. When one considers in historical sequence the many reports which have recently emerged from the Australian systems, however, particularly during the decade of the 1980s, some patterns do emerge.

Figure I lists for the two decades since 1970 those government-sponsored reports which have had a direct bearing on the administration of education systems in Australia. It is immediately apparent from the table of events
that the administration of the public school systems in Australia had not been the subject of regular, systematic, open, and public inquiry before the 1980s. The two States which appeared to be the forerunners of the 1980s restructuring were New South Wales and South Australia.

New South Wales:
New South Wales produced the document which was the archetype for the structural reform documents of the 1980s, but it appeared almost two decades earlier. The Wyndham Report (1957) in New South Wales had reshaped secondary education and produced some consequent changes within the Education Department, but the administration of the system was not the focus of rigorous investigation.

The Wyndham Report was in the classic tradition of the British reports like Hadow, Spens, Norwood and Plowden, and it had the same kind of impact, not only a transformation of the NSW secondary school arrangements (with subsequent spillover effects on Head Office management), but also on the other States. In addition, the NSW system had begun to decentralize into "areas" by 1948. As the system grew in size, it became inevitably more subject to internal politics and turbulence.

From this context grew two initiatives; the first was an attempt to establish school councils in NSW. The report of the panel, chaired by the Director-General of the time, Mr Jack Buggie, and titled <u>The Community and Its Schools</u> (1974) was not acceptable to the teacher unions and the recommendations were therefore not implemented. The Labor Party also moved in the late 1970s to create a NSW Education Commission (following the analogy of the Australian Schools Commission). An Interim Report (the "Hagan Report") of a working party researching the proposal appeared in 1976 and a second interim report one year later. The NSW Education Commission was established in the early 1980s.

NSW was relatively free of the restructurings which beset the other systems in the first half of the decade, although it should be noted that in 1984 the Swan/McKinnon Report appeared, proposing changes to parts of the secondary education area. In fact, the upper secondary school provisions - and low retention rates - have caused disquiet to every school system in Australia from 1970 onwards.

The effects of the election of the Greiner (Liberal/National Party) government in 1988 were outlined in the first section.

South Australia:

South Australia was the only State in the decade of the 1970s to plan a systematic restructuring of its school system. The committee of enquiry headed by Professor Peter Karmel produced a large, well-researched document in 1971. Karmel was later to play a profoundly formative role at the national level, both as the Chairman of the interim committee which preceded the Commonwealth's Schools Commission and as the first Chairman of the Commonwealth Tertiary Education Commission (CTEC).

Several aspects of the Karmel Inquiry in South Australia are interesting in retrospect. It was well ahead of its time in looking at the way the Education Department was structured, although its recommendations in this area could not be described as radical. It also introduced several key players to the national scene. Karmel presented the report to Hugh Hudson, a former academic colleague of Karmel's at Adelaide University, but who during the Inquiry had been elected to State Parliament and allocated the Education portfolio on Labor's front bench. He was later to follow Karmel as a Chairman of the Commonwealth Tertiary Education Commission. Jean Blackburn, Secretary to the committee of inquiry, was later a full-time member of the Australian Schools Commission. The South Australian Director-General was to become a member of Karmel's national Interim Committee for the Australian Schools Commission; Wilfred White was the first teacher member on the national schools body; and S.S.Dunn, a member of Karmel's South Australian Inquiry committee, later became the first full-time Chairman of the national Educational Research and Development Comittee.

Karmel's and Hudson's involvement - they were both economists - indicate that in large part economic factors prompted the inquiry in the first place. In fact, in 1969-70 the South Australian Director-General of Education, J.S.Walker, had coordinated the construction of the AEC document A Statement of Needs in Australian Education (1970) which documented the case for the federal government to

intervene in funding primary and secondary schools, and which in some measure opened the way for the establishment of the Australian Schools Commission when the Whitlam government came to office in 1972.

South Australian education was again comprehensively reviewed in the 1980s by a select committee chaired by the Director of the Australian Council for Educational Research, Dr. John Keeves, himself a former South Australian. By this stage, of course, the reconstruction in Victoria was well under way and the climate of reform was abroad, largely because of economic and enrolment declines. The two Keeves Reports, one dealing substantially with structures and the other with curricula, appeared in 1981 and 1982, and led to widespread restructuring within the South Australian Education Department, including a regrouping of the regions into five "Areas" and changes to the top management structure.

Since Keeves, South Australia instituted a Senior Executive Service, the members of which could be assigned to different roles in senior management; there followed substantial re-allocating of senior personnel out of central office agencies; and the abolition of all Deputy Director positions. In 1987 Professor Ian Cox completed a report reviewing the position of Superintendent, and three months later the public comments on the report were themselves collated and published. The end result was a reduction in the number of Superintendent positions, the devolution of more responsibility for the management of schools to the Principal, the re-assignment of some Superintendent functions, and the creation of a School Quality Review unit. In 1988, the Gilding Report presented plans to remodel the post-compulsory schooling provisions.

On Maundy Thursday in 1988, three of the system's top administrators were retired - the Director-General of Education (Mr John Steinle), his Deputy (Mr Jim Giles), and the most experienced Regional Director (Mr Colin Laubsch). A few weeks earlier the Director-General of the TAFE Department also retired.

The Labor government's response could hardly have been more dramatic. The TAFE position went to Mr Peter Kirby, an educational administrator with a remarkable national record but who was a resident of Victoria. The two top positions in the school system were filled on the same day by the appointment of Dr Ken Boston, also from Victoria, as the Director-General of Education and of Mr Garth Boomer from Canberra as the Associate Director-General. Dr Boston had earned a reputation as a tough administrator by piloting through Victoria's most recent administrative reconstruction. Mr

Boomer, a former South Australian, had been the Chair of the Australian Schools Commission until the national Labor government abolished the body after the 1987 federal election. Dr Boston's office is now called "Chief Executive and Director-General of Education". The 1989 political message was clear. Outsiders were being brought in to reconstruct the public education system.

In 1989 the new Director-General introduced a Draft Three Year Plan for the system, which implied that Areas and individual schools would also draw up development plans which could be systematically monitored.

The federal influence:

But after 1972, the dominant influence causing a re-alignment of powers and functions was the many-sided intervention of the federal (national) government. Its mode of operating was as significant as its funding. From the 1960s onwards the federal government had begun to intrude into education in a way never envisaged when the Australian constitution was first drawn up. When the Australian States federated in 1901, the constitution ruled that the federal parliament could allocate funds to the States as grants tied to specific projects, and it also had the power to grant scholarships to individual students, but schooling and higher education were State matters outside the jurisdiction of the national government.

Until the end of the Second World War in 1945, Commonwealth intervention in education at any level was piecemeal and unsystematic, limited to actions like setting up the National Fitness Council, giving some grants for research, and becoming involved with apprentice training.

The federal power is apparent in the case of higher education. The Commonwealth's Murray Report of 1957 led to federal subsidies for the State-established universities, and the creation of an Australian Universities Commission (modelled on Britain's University Grants Committee). Seven years later, another federal inquiry produced the Martin Report (1964) which led to the creation of a binary system, the establishing of Colleges of Advanced Education, the merger of the State Teachers Colleges into that sector, the extension of the same subsidy arrangements as applied to the universities, and the entrenchment of the Commonwealth's power in the post-school sector. The coup was completed when, in 1972-73, the Whitlam Government abolished university fees and took over the entire funding of tertiary education around Australia.

By the mid-1970s, the Technical and Further Education (TAFE) area was absorbed into the post-secondary sector, and in 1977 the university, advanced education and TAFE sectors were brought under one body, the Commonwealth Tertiary Education Commission (CTEC), which remained in existence until, ten years later, the Dawkins reforms of 1987 abolished the Commission, replaced it with a Higher Education Council, and made it an adjunct of the jumbo body called the National Board for Employment, Education and Training (NBEET).

The case is parallel to what has occurred in the pre-school, primary, and secondary areas. Before the Australian Schools Commission was created in 1973, the Commonwealth involvement had been minimal until the post-war years. The federal programs to build secondary school science laboratories and school libraries during the 1960s, the States' lobbying which culminated in the Australian Education Council's document A Statement of Needs in Australian Education(1970), the financial problems in Catholic education through the 1960s, the creation of the federal Department for Education and Science in 1967, and the pressure at the end of the 1960s to create Commonwealth-sponsored school systems for the two mainland territories (the Currie Report appeared in 1967) were harbingers for the massive Commonwealth intervention which followed the election of the Whitlam Government in 1972.

Two new public school systems, those for the Northern Territory (1971) and the Australian Capital Territory(1974), appeared in the early 1970s, the first new public systems to appear in a hundred years. Both were created through Commonwealth initiative. The group lobbying for an independent education authority in the Australian Capital Territory had drawn up the Currie Report in 1967; following a government white paper in 1974 and the receipt of public submissions, a panel produced the Hughes Report (1973) which provided the blueprint for the structure of the ACT school system. To provide an administrative basis on which to build the teaching service in the two Territory systems, the national Minister commissioned the Radford/Neal Report (Teachers for Commonwealth Schools, 1972).

The reconstruction of the 1980s borrowed some of its methodolgy from the federal actions of the 1970s. The first was the tendency to enunciate in a report of some kind the "ideas whose time had come", to give them both recognition and legitimacy, and then to follow with a clearly articulated plan, including a coherent program for funding and resourcing.

The select committee sometimes became a standing committee, statutory authority or Commission, a sort of permanent committee of inquiry. Each state developed a planning body to match the Commonwealth's Tertiary Education Commission, for example, and both Victoria and New South Wales created a body which parallelled the Schools Commission. Late in the 1980s, however, both the States and the Commonwealth disbanded some of these bodies to cut expenses and to tighten the Minister's control of the policy areas in his or her portfolio.

It is now obvious that the 1970s also made the States much more street-wise in their dealings on education, particularly in their dealings - collectively and individually - with the federal authorities. The period politicised education nationally, breaking the States out of the fairly amicable collegiality which characterised their interactions before 1970. In particular, their own creature, the Australian Education Council, began to assert itself as their national coordinating arm, especially politically, so that by the late 1980s it had virtually usurped the roles formerly filled by the Schools Commission.

III
Reconstruction in the 1980s

As it turned out, neither South Australia nor New South Wales led the way with the restructuring of the 1980s. The lead was taken by Victoria, but it was quickly followed by most of the other public school systems in the nation.

Victoria, the bell-wether state:
A wide-ranging restructuring of Australia's second largest state school system began under a Liberal government in 1980 and continued under the Labor government which succeeded it in 1982. The Victorian reconstruction is notable in that it introduced a planning device used in Great Britain. A "green paper", outlining the government's policy options, appeared in 1980 as a discussion document which produced public feedback and submissions. There followed in 1981 a "white paper", a statement of the policies the Minister had adopted in the light of those submissions. A team of management consultants then drew up detailed plans (called the "PA Report", after the consultants' firm which compiled the document) for rebuilding the Education Department on the basis of the principles laid down in the white paper.

These structural plans were subsequently revised under the Labor government which replaced the Thompson Ministry, especially to include elements like the State Board of Education. The restructuring plans were again reworked when Ian Cathie replaced Fordham as the Education Minister, this time leading to the creation of a Ministry of Education of which the public school system was merely one Division. A further blueprint (the Blackburn Report) appeared in 1985 with plans to restructure the provisions for post-compulsory education in Victoria, including the H.S.C., some parts of TAFE, and upper secondary schooling.

A Cabinet re-shuffle put two Ministers into the Education portfolio, and the subsequent events were outlined in Section I. With every change of Minister since 1980, therefore, the management structure of the Victorian public school system has been altered, and the senior managers have been dismissed or shuffled.

Tasmania:
Tasmania went through a process almost exactly parallel to the Victorian one. A Tasmanian white paper appeared in 1981, followed in 1982 by a consultancy report on the administration of the State school system. It was written by Professor Phillip Hughes who had a decade earlier chaired the panel which developed the blueprint for the ACT Schools Authority. The Hughes Report formed the basis for the Tasmanian restructuring which included regionalization, school councils and school-based budgetting as well as a remodelling of the top management structure. The progress of those reforms was unaffected by the fall of the Labor (Holgate) government in 1982 and has continued steadily through the life of the Liberal (Gray) government.

Northern Territory:
Even though it was a relatively new school system, the Northern Territory system was remodelled when limited powers of statehood were granted in 1976. The changes included the creation of the position of Minister for Education, and of a Department of Education headed by a Secretary. The Northern Territory had its own green paper in 1981, which led to the publication of the document Directions for the Eighties in 1983. Late in1984 the departmental structure underwent further revision. The Northern Territory was also revising its senior secondary examination provisions in 1989.

Western Australia:
When the Labor (Burke) government won office in Western Australia in 1983, it set up a select committee comprehensively to review schooling provisions throughout that State. The committee

was chaired by Mr. Kim Beazley, the former Federal Minister for Education in the Whitlam government and the person responsible for setting up the Australian Schools Commission in 1973. The Beazley committee spawned the McGaw Report which reviewed Year 12 Certificate practices in all States and Territories and recommended a new format for W.A. The Beazley Report was published in 1984, beginning a period of restructuring in W.A.

The administrative reconstruction in Western Australia was set in train by the Functional Review of the Education Department in 1985. There followed the creation of a Ministry of Education to replace the Department of Education in 1986, headed by a Chief Executive to replace the office of Director-General.The Ministry's Better Schools in Western Australia (1987) has become the key document to guide the rebuilding of the system which has removed the Regions, re-made the role of the Superintendent, and instituted "self-determining schools" (Louden, 1988: 13-14).

The Australian Capital Territory:
The ACT Schools Authority, which is responsible for Australia's newest public school system, has undergone a succession of reviews, even in its short history, They include the Cullen Report on primary education (1981) and the Steinle Report on high schools (1983). There was substantial restructuring both of the administration and of the school system's governing body in 1984/85.

In 1987, on the completion of the term of the second Chief Education Officer, an appointee from outside the system took over the position of "Chief Executive Officer". Dr Eric Willmot, although both an educator and a former Canberra resident, had been a Professor of Education in Queensland and earlier the Deputy Secretary of the Commonwealth Department of Aboriginal Affairs.

Immediately upon his accepting the position, Dr Willmot ordered a review of the administration of ACT schools, calling in as consultants Mr George Berkeley (recently retired as Director-General of Education in Queensland) and Mr N. Kenway (a senior officer in the Commonwealth public service). By the end of the year and in a sudden act of disenfranchisement, the Council which had operated the ACT system like a local education authority was abolished and its powers were vested in the Chief Executive Officer.

In the new administrative structure put in place during 1988, there was a spill of top positions and several of the system's most senior officers were displaced. In March 1989 the Territory citizens went to the polls to elect for the first time a legislative council with

the powers of self-government for the Territory. It was expected that one of the members would become Minister of Education for the ACT, and that the governance modes which the system had used since its inception in 1974 would be radically changed.

Queensland:
The Queensland State system of education has been influenced by a series of reviews. Following an investigation headed by Dr. W.C. Radford, at the time the Director of the Australian Council for Educational Research, a new
scheme for assessing student achievement in upper secondary school was introduced in the 1970s; it became known as the "Radford Scheme" and led to change within the administration as well as in schools. There followed a Review of School-Based Assessment (ROSBA) in the early 1980s under Professor E.W. Scott.

In 1985 a document entitled Education 2000: Issues and options for the future of Education in Queensland, a kind of government white paper, was published. It resulted from a special Task Force set up by the Minister in 1984 "to review organization and management throughout all levels of the Education Department", and which answered to a steering committee consisting of the Minister (Mr Lin Powell), the head of the Public Service Board (Dr C.K. Brennan), and the Director-General of Education (Mr George Berkeley). Among other things Education 2000 speculated on the creation of middle schools and of a new form for senior secondary education, and also on the shape of the system's administrative arrangements.

To ensure wide public discussion of the ideas, a summary of the paper was distributed and then a summary of the responses was also drawn up. There followed from June 1987 a number of papers under the title Meeting the Challenge, the second of which spelt out the "principles and program structures" which would be used for "organizational change at Head and Regional office levels within the Queensland Department of Education". The distribution of powers and functions within the system, the organization charts, and the designations of officers were being revised in 1989.

In summary, then, every public school system in Australia had changed within the decade; not a single system escaped the structural reform movement which engulfed Australian education in the late 1970s and throughout the 1980s

IV
Significant features of the reconstruction

So what patterns have emerged from this sweep of events? Our analysis of the reconstruction of Australian education during the 1980s is as yet incomplete, and since the systems do not show signs of stabilizing it will be difficult for some time to come to be definitive about the changes.
But we can identify several trends and common features.

1. The influence of national governments:
Regardless of what the country's constitution might say, it is now obvious that the federal government is both deeply involved in education and has become one of the key players in its policies and practices. In the 1970s and 1980s, national governments across the world have felt impelled to impose their own priorities on education. Sometimes the national intervention has been for defence purposes, but usually the justification has been economic. If the country is to compete within the new international economic order, within a context which rewards market competitiveness, where employment openings occur in the services sector rather than in factory production and manufacturing, and where a highly educated workforce is a necessary condition for success, then educational provisions do affect the country's economic performance and become a legitimate concern of national government.

2. The planning documents:
The structural changes in Australian education over the last 20 years have shown an interesting transition in methodology. They were at first based on a public report or policy document which encapsulated the existing situation and pointed the way to the next stage. But by the end of the 1980s, these documents had become more frequent and more slender as the pace of change overtook the last reconstruction and replaced it with a newer version.

3.The pattern of reports:
. The plethora of reports suggests that some States and Territories see things as problems before others do. There is undoubtedly some reinventing of the wheel just as there is also evidence that the States influence one another and follow one another. The reports do feed off each other. A simple frequency distribution shows a small number of important documents between 1957 and 1973, then a lean period of five or six years as though the nation needed time to digest what had gone before. From 1974 to 1979, all States and

Territories were working through the extensive changes brought about by Schools Commission funding and priorities.

A spate of reports and documents has come out from 1980 to the present time. This has not been merely a period of regrouping and co-ordinating systems which had undergone rapid change over the previous years. Rather the problems had not been wholly foreseen at the beginning of the 1980s, and the remedies imposed were economic rather than educational in origin. From the major policy documents which every State and Territory produced during the1980s, it is clear that some fundamental rethinking about the nature of educational administration is now going on.

4. The influential actors:

The influence of particular individuals, both separately and as part of select committees, has been considerable. It is worth observing that although the restructuring movement is now widespread, one keeps on encountering the same names in several contexts, in differing roles, and at several points in time.

We can cite several cases as illustrations. Dr. Ken McKinnon, former Director of Education in Papua New Guinea, on being re-patriated to Australia in 1973, was appointed the first Chairman of Australian Schools Commission. When his term expired in 1980, he became Vice-Chancellor of the University of Wollongong, from which position he inquired into the HSC examination system in NSW (1983), participated in the Swan/McKinnon Report for the NSW government (1984), and became part-time foundation Chairman of the Victorian State Board of Education, a body with functions parallelling both the NSW Education Commission and the Australian Schools Commission.

Mrs. Jean Blackburn had studied Economics at the University of Melbourne with Professor Peter Karmel and both subsequently moved to South Australia, Karmel as an Economics Professor and Blackburn as a CAE Lecturer. Blackburn was seconded to act as secretary to the Karmel Committee inquiring into South Australian education in 1970; she then became one of the first full-time members of the Australian Schools Commission where she worked closely with other prime movers like McKinnon, Tannock, A.W. Jones, Joan Kirner, Swan and Winder. When a Labor government was elected in Victoria, Blackburn was commissioned to write the report (1985) on provisions for post-compulsory education in that State.

In the same way, Phillip Hughes helped to set up the School of Education at the Canberra CAE, headed the committee which drew up the founding document for the ACT Schools Authority, became the first Chairman of that Authority, and then appeared as the expert advising on the restructuring of the Tasmanian system.

But there is another generation of influentials who exerted power especially through the 1980s. They include people like Dr Gregor Ramsey, Peter Kirby, Garth Boomer, Dr Ken Boston, Susan Ryan and Joan Kirner.
There is an obvious area here for researchers to sift through the networks of the Australian education establishment, to show who sponsored whom and what ideas, and to assess the relative impacts of the architects for the reconstructions.

5. Politicization of education:
The role of the Minister of Education has undergone a profound change since the 1970s. Their influence appears to have grown with their qualifications for the job. All of the current Ministers have undertaken a tertiary education. Two of the six State Ministers have a Ph.D. Many of the Ministers are former teachers or are married to a teacher. Because of these factors, there has been a growing tendency since the mid-1970s for the Minister to assume a much more prominent role not only in setting policy but also in managing the system. In some respects, the Minister has also become a Director-General. As Creed (1989) has shrewdly observed,
Will there be an end to restructuring? The clear answer is no. Ministers have an unjustified faith in organizational restructuring as a means of implementing their policies. Such change is highly visible and gives the impression of decisive Ministerial action within the short space of time available between elections. While Ministers continue to exercise the functions of the chief executive, restructuring will continue.

6. The impermanent head:
The rapid succession of people through the office of the chief executive has been one of the notable features of the 1980s. Gone are the times when the Director-General served through the period in office of several Ministers. Indeed, gone is the Director-General, the prominent educator who came up through the system and in his last years acted as educational spokeman (there have been no women Director-Generals) and an apolitical administrator. It is now likely that the Chief Executive will have been appointed for a fixed

term, and that he or she will lose the position when a new Minister succeeds to the portfolio; in short, he or she is being seen more and more as a political appointment. Making educational pronouncements as a professional is now a hazardous act, since the Chief Executive is now tending to be regarded as a manager; the Minister is the one who makes the pronouncements, educational as well as political.

Given this new context, it would not be surprising if many of the Chief Executives were appointed from outside the system, indeed from outside the State or Territory. As it happens, there are very few such appointments; the NSW case where Ramsey was appointed is interesting in that the decision to use an outsider was reversed. South Australia, the only State system presently with an outsider at its head, has had a history of considering and appointing outsiders (W.T.McCoy, E. Mander-Jones), and the two recently established Territory systems could hardly do otherwise. Another possibility is the appointment of a Chief Executive from an area other than Education, although no Australian school system has dared to take such a step. On the other hand, the Commonwealth Department, since it does not administer schools, has had a former teacher as its head only once since 1967, and then only for a few months. What does emerge, however, is the fact that the role of the chief education executive has changed quite markedly within the past five years.

7.Regionalization and Areas:

Regionalization has been proceeded with in all major systems although no substantial agreement exists about the optimum size of regions nor how they should ideally function. There is a natural reluctance to revert to the notion of regional offices as merely another tier in a pyramidal system, although the Western Australian system is the only one formally to have rejected that notion in favour of cooperative clusters of schools. But there is also a characteristic reluctance to see the possibility that some regions could become discrete local education authorities.

8. Demise of "teaching" divisions:

The reconstruction of Head Offices along functional lines has become widespread. Divisions according to function have replaced the traditional "teaching divisions" (Primary, Secondary and Technical, for example), removing the direct control of schools from any one division and enhancing the autonomy of schools, placing a premium on their ability to co-operate and cluster as well as to take on transactional and synoptic roles which previously were undertaken

by Inspectors or Directors. The central and regional offices now operate more in a servicing, planning, and coordinating mode. The impression still remains, however, that most of the underlying assumptions have been largely unresearched.

9.Devolution and school-based management:
"Devolution of responsibility" is a frequently used term in the reconstructions. The matter of school-based governance was addressed in the Keeves Reports (1981, 1982) in South Australia, the Hughes Report (1982) in Tasmania, and the Beazley Report (1984) in Western Australia. By 1983, the Victorian Minister could assert in his Ministerial Paper No 1 (an evidence of the priority accorded the point) a firm commitment to "genuine devolution...to the school community", to "collaborative decision-making processes", and to "a responsive bureaucracy, the main function of which is to service and assist schools".

A strong common theme in all the restructuring is that schools must be given greater responsibilty to order their own affairs. Terms like the "self-managing school" and the "self-determining school" have been used. There has been a lot of attention given to the role of the Principal as an effective manager.

10. Creation of a Senior Executive Service:
There is a tendency for the notion of a Senior Executive Service (SES) to be formalized. In such a setting, a person is not appointed to a set position but rather to a pool of senior managers (the term is used advisedly) from which he or she can be assigned to particular roles, projects or offices and for a specified period. The assumption underlying the SES is that administrative skill is a general trait and that expertise for a particular role is less valued than transferable managerial skills, especially those in financial and personnel management and in policy development. In consequence, top structures are much more fluid now than they were five years ago and the people in them are rolled over frequently (to borrow an appropriate financial term!). It is becoming less the case now that the persons in managerial roles must have a professional background in the service area for which their department is responsible - except where that department is involved with economic affairs.

11. The new metaphor:
The overwhelming impression left by the most recent round of reconstructions, however, is that there has been a profound shift in the way the organization of Australian education is now being conceived of, in schools no less than systemically. Bluntly, there has

been a paradigm shift. It could best be epitomized as a shift from "educational administration" to "efficient management". This conceptual change is of recent origin; indeed, it seems to have crystallized since 1985. The ideas of efficiency (in management), effectiveness (in measuring outcomes), accountability (in financial responsibility) and productivity (in meeting the market's requirements) were inherent in most of the reports written in the 1980s, but they were never so explicit as now. "Management" is the pervasive term being used.

Perhaps the most symbolically significant conveyor of the change is the way in which titles using the descriptor "Education" are falling out of currency and being replaced with titles including the terms "manager" and "executive". To be precise, the "Chief Education Officer" in the ACT has become the "Chief Executive Officer". Several of the Education Ministries are now headed by a person officially called "Chief Executive". The operational position once labelled "Director-General of Education" in Victoria is now called "Chief General Manager, Schools Division". The predominant descriptors have changed.

So also have the structures into which these positions are placed; they are being modelled upon the modern corporation, the flexible conglomerate which keeps central control of the essential and strategic areas but allows entrepreneurial freedom to the operating units which make up the body corporate. It is of course significant that so much of the re-structuring of the 1980s uses the terms of "corporate management". School systems are borrowing from business the organizational structures which appear to give simultaneously the flexibility to operate in volatile market conditions and also the means to stay in control of events.

The point was expressed succinctly by the Victorian Ministry's Chief Executive Dr Graham Allen (1988 12):
Corporate management is thus a new culture, not just a new process; a new way of thinking, as much as a new way of doing things; an intervention aimed at organizational improvement as the key to improvement in the quality of education. (italics mine)

The kind of mental framework which governs the thinking of the system planners and of those who practise educational administration is now beginning to acquire a new colouring in Australia.

The new extended metaphor which is used both to justify and to describe the restructuring is also causing education to be seen as a business operating in a market economy. Education institutions are represented as serving consumers or clients and competing for their custom. School boards or councils are the means whereby schools can guage the requirements of the client community. It is assumed that there will be competition for resources, that schools which can provide a marketable product will be the ones worthy to survive, that the school and its teachers will monitor their performance outcomes, that they will be entrepreneurial and find their niche in the market for their services. Nationally, education is described as an exportable commodity, and the revenue it earns in export dollars is often quoted.

Thus the new metaphor is pervasive. It has become part of the vernacular of education, it provides a pattern for policy development, and it has become reified and concrete in the new organizational structures being built for the management both of schools and of the systems to which they are attached. This is not to say that the new paradigm is destructive or antithetical to good education, but it has put those concerned with educational administration on their mettle. For the present, the market metaphor is being used by politicians, business people, and the public not only to explain the new patterns for education funding and resource management. It has also become the favoured way of explaining the education process itself. That being the case, can educators make the best of the new frameworks, and ensure that they foster the best in education and schooling?

Distribution of Key Reports and Documents

Year	States	Territories	Federal
1967		Currie Report (ACT)	[Dept of Ed &Sc created]
1968			
1969			
1970	Statement of Needs (AEC), Radford Rept (Qld)		
1971	Karmel Rept (SA)		
1972		Radford/Neal Rept (ACT & NT)	[Interim Schools Commis-sion]
1973			Karmel Rept (Fed)
		Hughes Rept (ACT), Campbell Rept (ACT)	
1974	Buggie Rept (NSW)		Kangan Rept (Fed) Fry Rept (Fed)
1975			
1976	Hagan Rept I(NSW)		
1977	Hagan Rept II(NSW)		
1978			
1979			

1980 Green Paper (Vic), White Paper (Vic),

1981 PA Rept (Vic), White Paper (Tas), Keeves Rept I (SA), Into the 80s (SA).

Green Paper (NT),
Cullen Rept (ACT)

1982 Hughes Rept (Tas), Keeves Rept II (SA)

1983 Ministerial Papers 1-4 (Vic), Swan/McKinnon Rept (NSW), Directions for the 80s (NT), Steinle Rept (ACT)

1984 Ministerial Papers 5-6 (Vic), Beazley Rept (WA)

1985 Blackburn Rept (Vic), Education 2000 (Qld)

QERC Rept (Fed)

1986 Taking Schools into the 1990s (Vic), Ministry Structures Rept (Vic), Education 2000 Rept of Submissions (Qld)

1987 Cox Rept (SA), Better Schools (WA), Secondary Ed (Tas), Statement of Corporate Goals (NSW), Structure & Org of Schools Div (Vic), Agenda for Excellence (Qld)

Berkeley/Kenway
Review (ACT)

1988

Strengthening Aust Schools (Fed)

Mapping the Aust Curric (AEC), Meeting the Challenge (Qld), Gilding Rept (SA), Scott Rept and Carrick Rept proceeding (NSW)

BIBLIOGRAPHY

ALLEN, G.J. "Corporate Management in Education : the Victorian case" in Sarros and Beare (1988).

ANGUS, L.B. The Administrative Restructuring of the Victorian Education System: Changes in the Regional Office and the Role of Senior Education Officers. Paper to AARE. Canberra : AARE. 1983.

BEARE, H. "The Structural Reform Movement in Australian Education and its Effect on Schools". Journal of Educational Administration. 41(2), Summer 1983. pp. 149-168.

BEARE, H. "Changing Structures in Education". Paper presented as part of "Seminar 85 on Catholic Education". Catholic Education Office, Melbourne. 1985.

BEARE, H. "Changing Structures in Education" in Simpkins, W.S., A.R. Thomas and E.B. Thomas (eds.) Principal and Change : The Australian Experience Armidale, NSW : University of New England Teaching Monographs. 1987.

BUGGIE, J. (Chairman). The Community and its Schools: Report of the Review Panel appointed by the Minister of Education. Sydney : Department of Education. 1974.

CATHIE, I. The Government Decision on the Report of the Ministry Structures Project Team. Melbourne : Victorian Ministry of Education. 1986.

COX, I. Report of the Review of Superintendents in the South Australian Department of Education. Adelaide : SA Government Printer. 1987.

CREED, P. "Seeking firm Ministry structure". The Herald (Melbourne). 28 February 1989.

DAWKINS, J.S. Strengthening Australia's Schools : A consideration of the focus and content of schooling. Canberra : Minister for Employment, Education and Training. May 1988.

EDWARDS, R.C.M. Structural Reform in Australian Education 1967-87 : An Analysis of Key Documents. Unpublished M.Ed. Thesis. University of Melbourne. 1989.

HANNAN, BILL — "A National Framework for the Curriculum". Education Victoria. March 1989. p.16.

HARMAN, G.S. — Administrative Structures for Providing Education Services at State Level. (Discussion Paper prepared for the Committee of Enquiry into Education in South Australia.) Centre for the Study of Higher Education, Melbourne University. October, 1980.

HARMAN, G.S. (ed.) — Managing Structural Change in Education in Asia and the Pacific : a Blueprint for Action. Canberra : AGPS. 1983.

HUGHES, P.W. and W.R. MULFORD — The Development of an Independent Education Authority. Hawthorn, Victoria : ACER. 1978.

LANGE, Rt. Hon. D. — Tomorrow's Schools : The Reform of Educational Administration in New Zealand. Wellington, New Zealand : NZ Government Printer. 1988.

LOUDEN, W. — "Creating a Ministry from a Department : a Rationale from the case of Western Australia". In Sarros and Beare (1988).

MACPHERSON, R.J.S. — Administrative Structure and the Action of Regional Directors : A Tentative Analysis of Structuration. Paper to AARE. Canberra : AARE. 1983.

McASEY, J. — "Greener bloodied by a year of willing axes". Age. 11 March 1989. p.11.

PRAETZ, H. — Public Policy and Catholic Schools. Australian Educational Review series, No.17. Hawthorn, Victoria : ACER. 1982.

RADFORD, W.C. and W.D. NEAL — Teachers for Commonwealth Schools. Melbourne : ACER. 1972.

SALLIS, J. — ACE Guide to the Education Reform Act, 1988. London : Advisory Centre for Education (College Hill Press). 1988.

SARROS, J. and H. BEARE (eds.) — Australian Contributions to Educational Management : Some Commentaries by Chief Education Executives. Perth, WA : Australian Council for Educational Administration. 1988.

SHEARS, L.W. Administrative Structures in Education. Melbourne : Office of the Coordinator-General of Education. 1984.

[Beazley Report] **Committee of Enquiry into Education in WA.** (Chairman : Kim E. Beazley) Education in Western Australia. Perth : WA Government Printer. 1984.

[Blackburn Report] **Ministerial Review of Post-compulsory Schooling.** (Chairperson : J. Blackburn) Discussion Paper. April 1984; Report (2 Vol.) March 1985. Melbourne : Victorian Government Printer.

[Campbell Report] **Report of the Working Committee on College Proposals for the ACT.** (Chairman : Dr. Richard Campbell) Secondary Education for Canberra. Canberra : AGPS. 1973.

[Cullen Report] **Report of the Committee to Review Primary Education in ACT Government Schools.** (Chairman : C.P. Cullen) Primary Children in the ACT. Canberra : ACT Schools Authority. 1981.

[Currie Report] **Report of a Working Party.** (Chairman : Sir George Currie) An Independent Education Authority for the Australian Capital Territory. Canberra : Department of Adult Education : Australian National University. 1967.

[Hagan Report] Interim Report of the Working Party for the Establishment of an Education Commission. (Chairman : Professor J.S. Hagan) Sydney : NSW Government Printer. 1976.

[Hagan Report] Second Interim Report of the Working Party for the Establishment of an Education Commission. (Chairman : Professor J.S. Hagan) Sydney : NSW Government Printer. 1977.

[Hughes Report] **Report of the Assessment Panel on the ACT Educatio Authority.** (Chairman : P. Hughes) A design for the governance and organization of education in the ACT. Canberra : AGPS. 1973.

[Hughes Report] **Government of Tasmania.** Review of Efficiency and Effectiveness of the Education Department. (Consultant : Professor P. Hughes) Hobart : Centre for Education, University of Tasmania. 1982.

[Kangan Report] **Committee on Technical and Further Education.** (Chairman : Mr. M. Kangan) TAFE in Australia : Report on needs in technical and further education. Canberra : AGPS. 1974.

[Karmel Report] **Report of the Committee of Enquiry into Education in South Australia 1969-70.**(Chairman : Professor Peter Karmel) Education in South Australia. Adelaide : South Australia Government Printer. 1971.

[Karmel Report] **Interim Committee for the Australian Schools Commission** (Chairman : Professor Peter Karmel) Report. Schools in Australia. Canberra : AGPS. 1973.

[Keeves Report] **First Report of the Committee of Enquiry into Education.** (Chairman : Dr. J.P. Keeves) Education and Change in South Australia. Adelaide : South Australia Government Printer. 1981.

[Keeves Report] **Second Report of the Committee of Enquiry into Education.** (Chairman : Dr. J.P. Keeves) Education and Change in South Australia. Adelaide : South Australia Government Printer. 1982.

[Martin Report] **Committee on the Future of Tertiary Education in Australia.** (Chairman : Sir Leslie Martin) Report. Melbourne : Victorian Government Printer. 1964.

[Murray Report] **Report of the Committee on Australian Universities.** (Chairman : Sir Keith Murray) Canberra : Commonwealth Government Printing Office. 1957.

[Picot Report] **Administering for Excellence : Effective Administratio in Education.** Report of the Taskforce to Review Education Administration. (Chairman : B. Picot) Wellington, New Zealand : NZ Government Printer. 1988.

[Radford Report] **Committee to Review the System of Public Examinations for Queensland Secondary School Students.** (Chairman : W.C. Radford) Brisbane : Department of Education. 1970.

[Steinle Report] **The Challenge of Change : A Review of High Schools in the ACT.** (Chairman of Committee of Review : Mr. John R. Steinle) Canberra : ACT Schools Authority. 1983.

[Swan/McKinnon Report] **SWAN, D. and K.R. MCKINNON**
Future Directions of Secondary Education in NSW. Sydney : NSW Education Department. 1983.

[Wyndham Report] **Report of the Committee Appointed to Survey Secondary Education in NSW.** (Chairman : Dr. H.S. Wyndham) Sydney : NSW Government Printer. 1957.

Australian Education Council.
A Statement of Needs in Australian Education. Adelaide : Australian Education Council. 1970.

Australian Education Council.
A Statement of Needs in Australian Education. Adelaide : Australian Education Council. 1970.

Australian Education Council.
A Statement of Needs in Australian Education. Adelaide : Australian Education Council. 1970.

Australian Education Council.
Mapping the Australian Curriculum Vol.I, The General Curriculum. Canberra : AEC. 1988.

Australian Education Council.
Mapping the Australian Curriculum Vol.I, The General Curriculum. Canberra : AEC. 1988.

Australian Education Council.
Mapping the Australian Curriculum Vol.I, The General Curriculum. Canberra : AEC. 1988.

Green Paper on Primary and Secondary Education in the Northern Territory
Directions for the 80s. Darwin : Northern Territory Government Printer. 1981.

Minister for Education. A proposal concerning the governance of ACT government schools. Canberra : AGPS. 1985.

National Catholic Education Commission.
The Education of Catholic Australians. Canberra: Federal Catholic Education Office. 1972.

National Catholic Education Commission.
The Education of Catholic Australians. Canberra: Federal Catholic Education Office. 1972.

National Catholic Education Commission.
The Education of Catholic Australians. Canberra: Federal Catholic Education Office. 1972.

Northern Territory Education Department.
Primary and Secondary Education in the Northern Territory : Directions for the 80s. (Green Paper). Darwin : Department of Education. 1981.

Northern Territory Education Department.
Primary and Secondary Education in the Northern Territory : Directions for the 80s. (Green Paper). Darwin : Department of Education. 1981.

Northern Territory Education Department.
Primary and Secondary Education in the Northern Territory : Directions for the 80s. (Green Paper). Darwin : Department of Education. 1981.

NSW Education Department. The New South Wales Public School System : A Statement of Corporate Purpose and Goals. Sydney : NSW Education Department. 1987.

NSW Education Department. The New South Wales Public School System : A Statement of Corporate Purpose and Goals. Sydney : NSW Education Department. 1987.

NSW Education Department. The New South Wales Public School System : A Statement of Corporate Purpose and Goals. Sydney : NSW Education Department. 1987.

Quality of Education Review Committee.
Quality of Education in Australia : Report of the Review Committee. Canberra : Commonwealth of Australia. 1985.

Quality of Education Review Committee.
Quality of Education in Australia : Report of the Review Committee. Canberra : Commonwealth of Australia. 1985.

Quality of Education Review Committee.
Quality of Education in Australia : Report of the Review Committee. Canberra : Commonwealth of Australia. 1985.

Queensland Department of Education.

Meeting the Challenge.

I. Future Directions for Education in Queensland.
II. Organizational Principles and Program Structures for The Queensland Department of Education.
III. The Studies Program.

Brisbane : Supplement to the Education Office Gazette. February 1988.

South Australian Education Department.
Into the 80s. Our Schools and their purposes. Adelaide. 1981.

Tasmanian Education Department.
Tasmanian Schools and Colleges in the 1980s. (White Paper). Hobart : Education Department of Tasmania. 1981.

Tasmanian Education Department.
Tasmanian Schools and Colleges in the 1980s. (White Paper). Hobart : Education Department of Tasmania. 1981.

Tasmanian Education Department.
Tasmanian Schools and Colleges in the 1980s. (White Paper). Hobart : Education Department of Tasmania. 1981.

Tasmanian Education Department.
White Paper on Tasmanian Schools and Colleges in the 1980s. Hobart. 1981.

Tasmanian Education Department.
Secondary Education : The Future: Policy Statement. Hobart : Tasmanian Education Department. 1987.

Victorian Education Department.
Green Paper on Strategies and Structures for Education in Victoria. Melbourne : Victorian Government Printer. 1980.

Victorian Education Department.
White Paper on Strategies and Structures for Education in Victorian Government Schools. Melbourne : Victorian Government Printer. 1980.

Victorian Education Department.
The Rationale and Definition of the Proposed Organization Structure. (Prepared by P.A. Australia) 1981.

Victorian Ministry of Education (Schools Division).
The Structure and Organization of the Schools Division. (Plan for implementation of the Government Decision on the Report of the Ministry Structures Project Team.)
Melbourne : Victorian Ministry of Education. December 1987.

Victorian Ministry Structures Project Team. Report :
The Report in Outline
Vol.I : Schools Division
Vol.II : Portfolio
Melbourne : Victorian Ministry fo Education. 1986.

Western Australia Ministry of Education.
Better Schools in Western Australia : a Programme for Improvement. Perth, WA : WA Ministry of Education. 1987.

Education 2000 : Issues and options for the Future of Education in Queensland. Brisbane : Queensland Education Department. 1985.

"Report of the Review of Superintendents in the Education Department of South Australia, August 1987" : A Summary of Respones.
Adelaide : SA Education Department. 1987.

"Report of the Review of Superintendents in the Education Department of South Australia, August 1987" : A Summary of Respones.
Adelaide : SA Education Department. 1987.

Twenty Thousand : A Summary of Responses to the Report of the Taskforce to Review Education Administration.
Wellington, New Zealand : NZ Government Printer. 1988.